

U.S. Appln. No. 09/676,645
Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

PATENT
450100-02736

JUL 20 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present Amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-16 are currently pending. Claims 1-3 and 9-14, which are independent, are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,263,152 to Hisatomi, et al. in view of Japanese Patent No. 09288677 A to Inai and in further view of European Patent No. 0858171 A2 to Yonemitsu, et al.

Claims 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Hisatomi, et al. in view of Japanese Patent No. 09288677 A to Inai and European Patent No. 0858171 A2 to Yonemitsu, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813,681 to Kanota, et al.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Hisatomi, et al. in view of Japanese Patent No. 09288677 A to Inai and European Patent No.

U.S. Appln. No. 09/676,645
Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2006

PATENT
450100-02736

0858171 A2 to Yonemitsu, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,570,837 to Kikuchi, et al.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia:

“...wherein the file structure has a first data unit and a second data unit, the second data unit being a set of the first data unit;

wherein a plurality of first data units and a plurality of second data units are matched with a successive record length,

wherein each second data unit is adjacent to a corresponding first data unit,

wherein a successive record length is a length of data that can written without a jumping operation...” (emphasis added)

As under stood by Applicants U.S. Patent No. 6,263,152 to Hisatomi, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hisatomi”) relates to a recording apparatus that generates a registration trigger automatically or in response to an instruction in order to search for an image recorded on an optical disk.

As under stood by Applicants Japanese Patent No. 09288677 A to Inai (hereinafter, merely “Inai”) relates to an information integrating method, apparatus, and system for use on the world wide web to data inspection.

As under stood by Applicants European Patent No. 0858171 A2 to Yonemitsu, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Yonemitsu”) relates to encoding a digital signal with which a transmission buffer does not overflow even if recording of a signal on a recording medium is temporarily inhibited by an external shock or an unsatisfactory state of communication.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Hisatomi, Inai, or Yonemitsu, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above identified features of claim

U.S. Appl. No. 09/676,645
Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2006

PATENT
450100-02736

1. Specifically, Applicants submit that Hisatomi, Inai, and Yonemitsu fail to teach or suggest that the file structure has a first data unit and a second data unit, the second data unit being a set of the first data unit, wherein a plurality of first data units and a plurality of second data units are matched with a successive record length, wherein each second data unit is adjacent to a corresponding first data unit, and wherein a successive record length is a length of data that can be written without a jumping operation, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore claim 1 is patentable.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of prior art lacks motivation and is a result of improper hindsight. The Office Action appears to have pieced together a mosaic of features from each of the references. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

For reason similar to those described above, Applicants submit that claims 2, 3, and 9-14 are also patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the above-identified reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

U.S. Appln. No. 09/676,645
Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2006

PATENT
450100-02736


CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800